



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,034	01/16/2002	Todd Samstrom	186361/US	1251
25763 7590 01/03/2007 DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT SUITE 1500 50 SOUTH SIXTH STREET MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-1498			EXAMINER HINZE, LEO T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2854	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/03/2007	PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/052,034

Applicant(s)

SARNSTROM, TODD

Examiner

Leo T. Hinze

Art Unit

2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,10-22 and 24-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,10-22 and 24-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 December 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2854

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-5 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginsburg, US 921,974 (hereafter Ginsburg) in view of Gerson, US 3,150,582 (hereafter Gerson).

- a. Regarding claim 1:

Ginsburg teaches an apparatus for adjusting a die of a printing press, comprising: a chase (A, Fig. 1) defining a vertical axis and a horizontal axis, wherein the chase comprises first and second vertical ends and first and second horizontal ends (chase A has four sides arranged in a square, Fig. 1); a die frame (B, Fig. 1) slidably secured to the chase to allow the adjustment of the die frame along the chase from the first vertical end to the second vertical end and from the first horizontal end to the second horizontal end ("frame may be adjusted to its proper central position", p. 1 lines 62-63); it is desirable to be able to quickly reset-up new dies (page 1, lines 17-18).

Ginsburg does not teach at least one horizontal guide secured with the chase and at least one vertical guide secured in the chase, the at least one horizontal guide and the at least one vertical guide slidably connected to the die frame to slidably secure the die frame to the chase

Art Unit: 2854

and to permit the die frame to be slidably positioned along both the at least one horizontal guide and the at least one vertical guide; a horizontal mount coupled to the at least one horizontal guide; a vertical mount coupled to the at least one vertical guide; a horizontal guide block movably secured to the chase to slide along the horizontal axis; and at least one of a coarse vertical adjustment mechanism and a coarse horizontal adjustment mechanism; and at least one of a coarse vertical adjustment mechanism and a fine horizontal adjustment mechanism; wherein the coarse vertical adjustment mechanism and/or fine vertical adjustment mechanism is coupled to the vertical mount and the coarse horizontal adjustment and/or fine horizontal adjustment mechanism is coupled to the horizontal mount.

Gerson teaches: an apparatus for adjusting a die comprising: a vertical axis and a horizontal axis; a small frame for holding the image creating elements (28, 36, Fig. 1) slidably secured to a machine frame (24, 26, 47, 48, 58, Fig. 1) to allow the adjustment of the small frame in the vertical axis and the horizontal axis; at least one horizontal guide (59, Fig. 1) and at least one vertical guide (80, Fig. 1), the at least one horizontal guide and the at least one vertical guide slidably connected to the frame to slidably secure the frame and to permit the frame to be slidably positioned along both the at least one horizontal guide and the at least one vertical guide; a horizontal mount (61, Fig. 1) coupled to the at least one horizontal guide; a vertical mount (51, Fig. 1) coupled to the at least one vertical guide; a horizontal guide block (62, Fig. 1) movably secured to slide along the horizontal axis; and at least one of a coarse vertical adjustment mechanism (“means 34 serves to provide coarse adjustment in vertical displacement,” col. 3, ll. 39-40;) and a coarse horizontal adjustment mechanism (“the body 51 may be manually shifted

Art Unit: 2854

along the member 73 for an approximate or coarse displacement,” col. 4, ll. 6-7); and at least one of a fine vertical adjustment mechanism (33, Figs. 2 and 3) and a fine (76, Fig. 11; “precise selection of fine space intervals both vertically and horizontally”, col. 1, lines 55-56) horizontal adjustment mechanism; wherein the coarse vertical adjustment mechanism and/or fine vertical adjustment mechanism is coupled to the vertical mount (see Fig. 3 generally for arrangement of vertical mount and adjustment mechanisms) and the coarse horizontal adjustment and/or fine horizontal adjustment mechanism is coupled to the horizontal mount (see Fig. 11 generally for arrangement of horizontal mount and adjustment mechanisms); and that such an apparatus provides very rapid and convenient shifting and positioning (col. 1, lines 53-56), and precise alignment and the ability to return to predetermined positions as selected by the user (col. 1, lines 45-50).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ginsburg to replace the set screw adjusting and securing mechanism with the adjusting and securing mechanisms of Gerson, including at least one horizontal guide secured with the chase and at least one vertical guide secured in the chase, the at least one horizontal guide and the at least one vertical guide slidably connected to the die frame to slidably secure the die frame to the chase and to permit the die frame to be slidably positioned along both the at least one horizontal guide and the at least one vertical guide; a horizontal mount coupled to the at least one horizontal guide; a vertical mount coupled to the at least one vertical guide; a horizontal guide block movably secured to the chase to slide along the horizontal axis; and at least one of a coarse vertical adjustment mechanism and a coarse horizontal adjustment

Art Unit: 2854

mechanism; and at least one of a coarse vertical adjustment mechanism and a fine horizontal adjustment mechanism; wherein the coarse vertical adjustment mechanism and/or fine vertical adjustment mechanism is coupled to the vertical mount and the coarse horizontal adjustment and/or fine horizontal adjustment mechanism is coupled to the horizontal mount, because Gerson teaches that coarse and fine adjustment in the vertical and horizontal direction is advantageous for providing very rapid and convenient shifting and positioning as well as precise alignment and the ability to return to predetermined positions as selected by the user.

b. Regarding claim 3, the combination of Ginsburg and Gerson substantially teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 3 above. Ginsburg also teaches the chase comprising an upper horizontal member, a lower horizontal member, a left vertical member secured to the upper horizontal member and the lower horizontal member and a right vertical member secured to the upper horizontal member and the lower horizontal member (A, Fig. 1).

c. Regarding claim 4, the combination of Ginsburg and Gerson substantially teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 3 above. Gerson also teaches wherein the vertical mount (51, Figs. 1 and 3) is movably secured to the at least one vertical guide, with the frame secured to the vertical slidable mount to slidably connect the frame to the at least one vertical guide; and the horizontal mount (61, Figs. 1 and 11) is movably secured to the at least one horizontal guide and secured to a first end of the at least one vertical guide; and wherein a second end of the at least one vertical guide is slidably secured to one of the upper horizontal member and the lower horizontal member of the chase to permit the horizontal movement of the second end the at least one vertical guide along one of the upper horizontal member and the

Art Unit: 2854

lower horizontal member.

d. Regarding claim 5:

The combination of Ginsburg and Gerson substantially teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 4 above.

The combination of Ginsburg and Gerson does not teach the second end of the at least one vertical guide secured to a sliding element to slidably secure the second end of the at least one vertical guide to one of the upper horizontal member and the lower horizontal member of the chase, the sliding element securedly attached to the second end of the at least one vertical guide and slidably attached to one of the upper horizontal member and the lower horizontal member.

Gerson also teaches the second end (61, Fig. 1) of the at least one horizontal guide (80, Fig. 1) secured to a sliding element (61, Fig. 1) to slidably secure the second end of the at least one horizontal guide to the left vertical member (59, Fig. 5) of the machine frame (24, 26, 47, 48, 58, Fig. 1), the sliding element securedly attached to the second end of the at least one vertical guide and slidably attached to the left vertical member (Figs. 1, 5).

It has been held that mere rearrangement of parts is not sufficient to patentably distinguish over the prior art. See MPEP § 2144.04 (VI).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to additionally modify Ginsburg wherein the second end of the at least one horizontal guide secured to a sliding element to slidably secure the second end of the at least one horizontal guide to the left vertical member of the machine frame, the sliding element securedly attached to the second end of the at least one vertical guide and slidably attached to the left

Art Unit: 2854

vertical member, and to juxtapose the horizontal and vertical axis, because a person having ordinary skill in the art would recognize that while in a machine of vertical orientation taught by Gerson, having the horizontal and vertical axis disposed as taught by Gerson would be advantageous for ease of adjustment, but in a machine of apparent horizontal orientation as taught by Ginsburg, a person having ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the machine would function equally as well with the horizontal and vertical axis disposed as required for each particular job.

e. Regarding claim 24:

Ginsburg teaches an interchangeable die apparatus, including a method for adjusting a die of a printing press, comprising: providing a die (F, Fig. 1); providing a die fixture including a chase (A, Fig. 1), the chase defining a vertical and a horizontal axis and comprising first and second vertical ends and first and second horizontal ends (chase A has four sides arranged in a square, Fig. 1), and a die frame (B, Fig. 1) slidably secured to the chase to allow the die frame to slide along the chase from the first vertical end to the second vertical end and from the first horizontal end to the second horizontal end; mounting the die in the die frame; mounting the die fixture in the printing press (p. 1, lines 46-79); and that it is desirable to be able to quickly reset-up new dies (page 1, lines 17-18).

Ginsburg does not teach coarsely adjusting the position of the die by sliding the die along at least one of the vertical axis and the horizontal axis; and refining the position of the die by sliding the die along at least one of the vertical axis and the horizontal axis.



Art Unit: 2854

Gerson teaches: coarsely adjusting the position of a image creating elements (28, 36, Fig. 1) by sliding the image creating elements along at least one of the vertical axis and the horizontal axis (“coarse adjustment in vertical displacement”, col. 3, lines 39-40); and refining the position of the image creating elements by sliding the image creating elements along at least one of the vertical axis and the horizontal axis (“precise selection of fine space intervals both vertically and horizontally”, col. 1, lines 55-56); that such an apparatus provides very rapid and convenient shifting and positioning (col. 1, lines 53-56), and precise alignment and the ability to return to predetermined positions as selected by the user (col. 1, lines 45-50).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ginsburg by coarsely adjusting the position of the die by sliding the die along at least one of the vertical axis and the horizontal axis; and refining the position of the die by sliding the die along at least one of the vertical axis and the horizontal axis, because Gerson teaches that coarse and fine adjustment in the vertical and horizontal direction is advantageous for providing very rapid and convenient shifting and positioning as well as precise alignment and the ability to return to predetermined positions as selected by the user.

f. Regarding claim 25, the combination of Ginsburg and Gerson teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 3 above. Ginsburg also teaches wherein the at least one coarse vertical adjustment mechanism is contained within the vertical mount (see Fig. 3 generally for arrangement of vertical mount and adjustment mechanisms) and the at least one coarse horizontal adjustment mechanism is contained within the horizontal mount (see Fig. 11 generally for arrangement of horizontal mount and adjustment mechanisms).

Art Unit: 2854

g. Regarding claim 26, the combination of Ginsburg and Gerson teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 3 above. Ginsburg also teaches wherein the at least one horizontal fine adjustment mechanism is contained within the horizontal mount (see Fig. 11 generally for arrangement of horizontal mount and adjustment mechanisms).

3. Claims 10, 12, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginsburg in view of Gerson as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Leibovich et al., US 4,723,086 (hereafter Leibovich).

a. Regarding claim 10:

The combination of Ginsburg and Gerson substantially teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 4 above.

The combination of Ginsburg and Gerson does not teach at least one of the vertical guides comprising a spirally threaded vertical guide.

Leibovich teaches a mechanism allowing coarse and fine positioning (col. 1, lines 17-18) of a frame (65, Fig. 6) in X-Y directions, including: at least one of the vertical (58b, Fig. 6) and horizontal (58a, Fig. 6) guides comprising a spirally threaded vertical guide; that such a mechanism is advantageous for reducing complexity and subsequent cost, and provides better stability and better repeatability of the chosen position (col. 1, line 62 through column 2, line 1).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Ginsburg wherein at least one of the vertical guides comprises a spirally threaded guide, because Leibovich teaches that a spirally threaded guide is

Art Unit: 2854

advantageous for reducing complexity and subsequent cost, and provides better stability and better repeatability of the chosen position.

b. Regarding claim 12, the combination of Ginsburg, Gerson and Leibovich substantially teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 10 above. Leibovich also teaches the spirally threaded vertical guide received in a vertical bore of the vertical mount in a gearing relationship such that when the vertical spirally threaded rod is rotated the vertical mount moves along the vertical axis of the chase (col. 4, lines 55-67).

c. Regarding claim 17:

The combination of Ginsburg and Gerson substantially teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 4 above.

The combination of Ginsburg and Gerson does not teach at least one of the at least one horizontal guides comprising a spirally threaded horizontal guide.

Leibovich teaches a mechanism allowing coarse and fine positioning (col. 1, lines 17-18) of a frame (65, Fig. 6) in X-Y directions, including: at least one of the vertical (58b, Fig. 6) and horizontal (58a, Fig. 6) guides comprising a spirally threaded guide; that such a mechanism is advantageous for reducing complexity and subsequent cost, and provides better stability and better repeatability of the chosen position (col. 1, line 62 through column 2, line 1).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Ginsburg wherein at least one of the horizontal guides comprises a spirally threaded guide, because Leibovich teaches that a spirally threaded guide is

Art Unit: 2854

advantageous for reducing complexity and subsequent cost, and provides better stability and better repeatability of the chosen position.

d. Regarding claim 18, the combination of Ginsburg, Gerson and Leibovich substantially teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 17 above. Leibovich also teaches the spirally threaded horizontal guide received in a horizontal bore of the horizontal mount in a gearing relationship such that when the spirally threaded horizontal guide is rotated, the horizontal mount moves along the horizontal axis of the chase (col. 4, lines 55-67).

4. Claims 11, 13, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginsberg in view of Gerson and Leibovich as applied to claims 10, 12, and 18 above, and further in view of Posh, US 3,449,971 (hereafter Posh).

a. Regarding claims 11 and 13:

The combination of Ginsburg, Gerson and Leibovich substantially teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claims 10 and 12 above.

The combination of Ginsburg and Gerson does not teach wherein the vertical fine adjustment mechanism comprises a spur gear and a worm gear, the spur gear attached to the spirally threaded vertical guide and the worm gear meshing with the spur gear such that the spur gear rotates the spirally threaded vertical rod when the worm gear is rotated.

Posh teaches a linear actuator (10, Fig. 1) with a worm gear (32, Fig. 2) meshing with a pair of spur gears (18, 20, Fig. 1), such that when the worm gear is rotated, the spur gear rotates a spirally threaded shaft (12, Fig. 1), to cause relative motion between the rod and the housing (14,

Art Unit: 2854

Fig. 1). Posh teaches that such an actuator is advantageous for very precise movements (col. 3, lines 30-32) and is very compact (col. 1, line 32).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Ginsburg to use for the fine horizontal and vertical adjustment mechanisms an actuator with a worm gear and a spur gear and a shaft attached to the spur gear and movable when the worm gear is rotated, because Posh teaches that such an actuator is advantageous for generating very precise movements and is very compact.

b. Regarding claim 19:

The combination of Ginsburg, Gerson and Leibovich substantially teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 18 above.

The combination of Ginsburg and Gerson does not teach wherein the fine horizontal adjustment mechanism comprises a spur gear attached to the spirally threaded horizontal guide, and a worm gear, with the worm gear meshing with the spur gear such that, when the worm gear is rotated, the spur gear rotates the spirally threaded horizontal guide to move the horizontal mount along the horizontal axis of the chase.

Posh teaches a linear actuator (10, Fig. 1) with a worm gear (32, Fig. 2) meshing with a pair of spur gears (18, 20, Fig. 1), such that when the worm gear is rotated, the spur gear rotates a spirally threaded shaft (12, Fig. 1), to cause relative motion between the rod and the housing (14, Fig. 1). Posh teaches that such an actuator is advantageous for very precise movements (col. 3, lines 30-32) and is very compact (col. 1, line 32).

Art Unit: 2854

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Ginsburg to use for the fine horizontal and vertical adjustment mechanisms an actuator with a worm gear and a spur gear and a shaft attached to the spur gear and movable when the worm gear is rotated, because Posh teaches that such an actuator is advantageous for generating very precise movements and is very compact.

5. Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginsberg and Gerson in view of Leibovich as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Gortner, US 6,598,868 (hereafter Gortner).

a. Regarding claim 14:

The combination of Ginsberg, Gerson and Leibovich teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 12 above.

The combination of Ginsburg and Gerson does not teach: wherein the coarse vertical adjustment mechanism comprises a vertical actuator movably received within a vertical actuator receiving cavity in the vertical mount and having an at least partially threaded bore extending through the vertical actuator, the at least partially threaded bore including receiving threads and being coextensive with the vertical bore of the vertical mount, the at least partially threaded bore providing the gearing relationship with the spirally threaded vertical guide, and the at least partially threaded bore being sized to release the spirally threaded vertical guide when the vertical actuator is displaced relative to the vertical mount.

Gortner teaches a method of coarsely adjusting a device on a threaded rod, including: a coarse adjustment, the coarse adjustment including an actuator (115, Fig. 17) movably received

Art Unit: 2854

within an actuator receiving cavity (117, Fig. 17) in the mount (118, Fig. 17) and having an at least partially threaded bore (122, Fig. 17) extending through the actuator, the at least partially threaded bore including receiving threads (Figs. 17 and 18) and being coextensive with the bore of the mount, the at least partially threaded bore providing the gearing relationship with the spirally threaded guide (121, Fig. 17), and the at least partially threaded bore being sized to release the spirally threaded guide when the actuator is displaced relative to the mount.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Ginsburg to include a coarse adjustment actuator as taught by Gortner, because Gortner teaches that such an actuator mechanism is advantageous for freeing a mount for displacement along the length of a threaded rod, that such a mechanism is well known in the art, and a person having ordinary skill in the art would recognize that such a mechanism is a suitable alternative to the actuating mechanism of Ginsburg.

b. Regarding claim 15, the combination of Ginsberg, Gerson, Leibovich, and Gortner teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 14 above. Gortner also teaches the receiving threads of the partially threaded bore biased in a gearing relationship with the spirally threaded guide by a compressible element (123, Fig. 17) biased between a bottom surface of the actuator and a bottom of the cavity in the mount.

c. Regarding claim 16, the combination of Ginsberg, Gerson, Leibovich, and Gortner teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 15 above. Gortner also teaches the compressible element comprising a coiled spring (123, Fig. 17).

6. Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginsberg,

Art Unit: 2854

Gerson and Leibovich in view of Posh as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Gortner.

a. Regarding claim 20:

The combination of Ginsberg, Gerson, Leibovich and Posh teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 18 above.

The combination of Ginsburg and Gerson does not teach: wherein the coarse horizontal adjustment mechanism comprises a horizontal actuator movably received within a horizontal actuator receiving cavity in the horizontal mount and having an at least partially threaded bore extending through the actuator, the at least partially threaded bore including receiving threads and being coextensive with the horizontal bore of the horizontal mount, the at least partially threaded bore providing the gearing relationship with the spirally threaded horizontal guide, and the at least partially threaded bore being sized to release the spirally threaded vertical guide when the horizontal actuator is displaced relative to the horizontal mount.

Gortner teaches a method of coarsely adjusting a device on a threaded rod, including a coarse adjustment, the coarse adjustment including an actuator (115, Fig. 17) movably received within an actuator receiving cavity (117, Fig. 17) in the mount (118, Fig. 17) and having an at least partially threaded bore (122, Fig. 17) extending through the actuator, the at least partially threaded bore including receiving threads (Figs. 17 and 18) and being coextensive with the bore of the mount, the at least partially threaded bore providing the gearing relationship with the spirally threaded guide (121, Fig. 17), and the at least partially threaded bore being sized to release the spirally threaded guide when the actuator is displaced relative to the mount.



Art Unit: 2854

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Ginsburg to include a coarse adjustment actuator as taught by Gortner, because Gortner teaches that such an actuator mechanism is advantageous for freeing a mount for displacement along the length of a threaded rod, that such a mechanism is well known in the art, and a person having ordinary skill in the art would recognize that such a mechanism is a suitable alternative to the actuating mechanism of Ginsburg.

b. Regarding claim 21, the combination of Ginsberg, Gerson, Leibovich, Posh and Gortner teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 20 above. Gortner also teaches the receiving threads of the partially threaded bore biased in a gearing relationship with the spirally threaded guide by a compressible element (123, Fig. 17) biased between a bottom surface of the actuator and a bottom of the cavity in the mount.

c. Regarding claim 22, the combination of Ginsberg, Gerson, Leibovich, Posh and Gortner teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 21 above. Gortner also teaches the compressible element comprising a coiled spring (123, Fig. 17).

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed 23 October 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

8. Applicant argues on p. 8 that Ginsburg is fundamentally lacking in teaching or suggesting claim 1. The examiner agrees. However, the examiner has not relied on Ginsburg to reject claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipating each and every element of claim 1.

9. Applicant argues on p. 7 that Ginsburg has no teaching of slidably securing a die frame

Art Unit: 2854

within a chase. But Fig. 1 of Ginsburg shows the die frame B secured in the chase A, in a manner in which the die frame B would slide on the supporting chase surface if the set screws a' were turned.

10. Applicant argues on p. 8 that the language of claim 1 requires a range of adjustment that Ginsburg lacks. However, it appears from Fig. 1 of Ginsburg, based on the length of the adjustment screws, that the die frame of Ginsburg (B, Fig. 1) is adjustable nearly to the inner limits of the chase frame (A, Fig. 1), save for the limits imposed by the wing nuts. This movement of Ginsburg appears to satisfy the limitations of claim 1 recited in the passage "a die frame slidably secured to the chase to allow adjustment of the die frame along the chase from the first vertical end to the second vertical end and from the first horizontal end to the second horizontal end."

11. Applicant argues on p. 9 that there is no disclosure in Gerson of a mechanism to perform coarse vertical adjustments. Gerson teaches coarse adjustments in both planes ("means 34 serves to provide coarse adjustment in vertical displacement," col. 3, ll. 39-40; "the body 51 may be manually shifted along the member 73 for an approximate or coarse displacement," col. 4, ll. 6-7).

12. Applicant argues on p. 11 that the language of claim 1, particularly the definition of "chase," requires a range of movement of the apparatus that is lacking in Gerson, because the apparatus of Gerson only provides for slidable adjustment in the area of the plate support 22 (Fig. 1), and not some larger area. However, it appears that the slidable apparatus of Gerson, as combined with Ginsburg, offers an equivalent range of adjustment as the claimed apparatus. As

Art Unit: 2854

the examiner interprets claim 1, particularly in light of Fig. 1 of the specification, it appears that the adjustment of the die frame 90 in the chase 20 of the instant application is limited by the horizontal and vertical guides, and as such, has an adjustment envelope that is smaller than the envelope enclosed by the chase. This limited range of movement of the die frame 90 in the chase 20 of the instant application appears consistent with Gerson, which shows that the range of adjustment of the die frame (36, Fig. 1) is somewhat less than the overall envelope enclosed by the machine. Therefore, it appears that the mechanism of Gerson, combined with Ginsburg, teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 above.

13. Applicant argues on p. 10 that they are unable to identify how the examiner can assert that Gerson Fig. 11 illustrates the fine horizontal adjustment mechanism coupled to the horizontal mount. Fig. 11 shows the mount (51) and the horizontal shift lever (76) which is used to provide "precise horizontal positioning" (col. 4, ll. 9-10).

14. In response to applicant's arguments on pp. 11 against Gerson individually, particularly that Gerson does not teach a chase, and therefore cannot teach a horizontal guide block movably secured to the chase, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The combination of Ginsburg and Gerson together teach a horizontal guide block movably secured to the chase.

15. In response to applicant's arguments on p. 11, the examiner asserts that the combination of Ginsburg and Gerson does teach "a die frame slidably secured to the chase to allow

Art Unit: 2854

adjustment of the die frame along the chase from the first vertical end to the second vertical end and from the first horizontal end to the second horizontal end” and “a horizontal guide block movably secured to the chase to slide along the horizontal axis” as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 above.

16. Regarding the arguments on pp. 12-15 that the additional secondary references do not supply the deficiencies of the Gerson and Ginsburg combination, the arguments are moot, as the examiner has set forth above how the combination of Gerson and Ginsburg teach all that the examiner asserts.

### *Conclusion*

17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2854

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leo T. Hinze whose telephone number is (571) 272-2167. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-2258. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Leo T. Hinze  
Patent Examiner  
AU 2854  
19 December 2006



**REN YAN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**